



## SACOG Board of Directors

June 9, 2010

### Alternative Scenarios for the Metropolitan Transportation Plan Update

**Issue:** What is the framework for creating Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) transportation and land use scenarios to be developed over the summer of 2010 for use in public workshops in fall 2010?

**Recommendation:** The Transportation Committee recommends that the Board direct staff to develop three transportation and land use scenarios using the framework described below.

**Committee Action/Discussion:** For the 2011 MTP update, SACOG must create transportation and land use scenarios for education and outreach in public workshops in the fall of 2010. Staff proposes to create three scenarios using the draft regional growth projections from the Center for the Continuing Study of the California Economy (with 150,000 fewer dwelling units and 165,000 fewer jobs than the current MTP). The scenario approach described below is a broad outline of the basic framework for the scenarios. At its June 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting, the Transportation Committee recommended that Scenarios 2 and 3 be distinctly different from each other, with Scenario 3 being more aggressive, on land use and transit integration, in particular. These recommendations have been incorporated into the Scenario framework. Staff proposes to work with local agency staffs on the details of the scenarios within this broad framework and consider input received through the MTP focus groups. An update of the focus groups process will be presented to this committee under a separate item.

Each scenario will have a land use pattern paired with both a low-end and high-end transportation budget of \$30 and \$40 billion, respectively. These budgets bracket a range of \$5 billion lower and higher than projected revenue that staff anticipates over the 25-year MTP planning period. The higher budget is intended to test the benefits of achievable investments if the region sees increases in federal, state and local revenues. The land use component of these scenarios will represent a realistic range of possible future development patterns through the year 2035 based on adopted and proposed local plans and policies, market performance, and regulatory and resource constraints. For the transportation scenarios, the starting point will be a set of “common-to-all” projects, which account for at least half of the overall budget, with the remaining budget allocated to other projects tailored to meet the respective land use patterns and scenario budget. At this early stage, staff thinks these alternatives could also serve to bracket the range of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) alternatives that will be analyzed by the MTP Environmental Impact Report, though we will be refining these as we receive ongoing legal input. The scenarios can generally be described as:

*Scenario 1:* A refresh of the adopted MTP land use assumptions with the same housing stock of the adopted MTP (61 percent of new housing is compact) and least amount of development in Transit Priority Areas of the three scenarios. Transit service, pedestrian and bike improvements, and complete streets will be allocated to corridors with appropriate land uses. Roadway expansion will be balanced between relief of existing bottlenecks and congestion points, and future bottlenecks based on growth.

*Scenario 2:* Regional housing mix based on recent market performance and Blueprint housing mix (68 percent of new housing is compact). A higher proportion of new development in transit priority areas

compared to Scenario 1. Compared to Scenario 1, growth is focused somewhat more in the urban core of region and smaller urban and suburban centers. Like Scenario 1, transit service and complete streets will be allocated to corridors with appropriate land uses, but slightly higher thresholds will be applied than to Scenario 1. Roadway expansion will again be balanced between existing and future bottlenecks, but with the balance shifted slightly to existing bottlenecks.

Scenario 3: Land uses characteristics of Scenario 2 modified to increase transportation system performance. Regional housing mix increases share of attached housing, focused on areas of transit-oriented development. Share of growth in transit priority areas more focused than in Scenario 2 to find an optimum mix of development intensity and more transit service. Like Scenario 2, growth continues to be focused more in the urban core of region and smaller urban and suburban centers. Again, transit service will focus on higher density, more mixed corridors, but the thresholds would be higher than for Scenario 2. Roadway expansion will be shifted more toward addressing existing bottlenecks than Scenario 2.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever  
Executive Director

MM:KL:gg  
Attachment

Key Staff:      Matt Carpenter, Director of Transportation Services, (916) 340-6276  
                     Bruce Griesenbeck, Principal Transportation Analyst, (916) 340-6268  
                     Kacey Lizon, Senior Planner, (916) 340-6265

S:\SACOG\Board\BRDPCKTS\2010 Packets\June\14-MTP Alt Scenarios.doc 1000404

---

**PROPOSED FRAMEWORK FOR MTP PUBLIC WORKSHOP SCENARIOS**


---

<b>Scenario Name</b>	<b>Land Use</b>	<b>Transit</b>	<b>Local Streets Ped/Bike</b>	<b>Bridges and Freeways</b>
Sample Projects/ Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Compact Development</li> <li>■ Mixed Use</li> <li>■ Development in Transit Priority Areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Shuttles</li> <li>■ Commuter bus</li> <li>■ Fixed route bus</li> <li>■ BRT</li> <li>■ Street car</li> <li>■ LRT</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Bike Lanes</li> <li>■ ITS</li> <li>■ Complete Streets</li> <li>■ Street widening</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ ITS</li> <li>■ Auxiliary Lanes</li> <li>■ HOV Lanes</li> <li>■ Interchanges</li> <li>■ Bridges</li> <li>■ New Mixed Flow</li> </ul>
<b>1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Compact housing share = 61% (same as 2008 MTP)</li> <li>■ Compared to MTP: Smallest share of growth in TPAs of the 3 scenarios</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Emphasis on shuttles, commuter bus, fixed route bus</li> <li>■ BRT, street car and LRT where density/mix supports it</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Complete streets opportunities in new growth areas</li> <li>■ Some opportunity for complete streets “remodeling”</li> <li>■ Conventional street widening for bottlenecks</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Balance of projects between existing and future bottlenecks</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Compact housing share = 68% (similar to Blueprint)</li> <li>■ More growth in TPAs than #1</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ More opportunities for higher frequency bus and street car</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Similar to #1</li> <li>■ More opportunities for complete streets</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Emphasis on existing bottlenecks</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Higher share of growth in TPAs</li> <li>■ TPA growth more focused in location, higher density—more transit-oriented development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ More opportunities for streetcar and LRT, and other rail services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ More opportunities for complete streets</li> <li>■ Greater reliance on ITS/management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Greater emphasis on existing bottlenecks and urban core</li> </ul>